



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/811,246
Filing Date: March 29, 2004
Appellant(s): HIRAKAWA ET AL.

Ronald P. Kananen
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 9/12/2008 appealing from the Office action mailed 5/13/2008.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The following are the related appeals, interferences, and judicial proceedings known to the examiner which may be related to, directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal:

A decision on Appeal has been mailed in parent application No. 09/417,714 on 1/29/2004.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

Muraji et al. Patent 5,260,797

Matsuo et al. Patent 4,319,237

Song Patent 5,831,709

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 11-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muraji et al. (5,260,797) in view of Matsuo et al. (4,319,237).

As to **claim 11**, Muraji et al teach a liquid crystal display apparatus comprising a liquid crystal display panel(3, 59, 60, 61)(see figures 1, 3, 5, 6, 8 and column 3, lines 29- 39); a chrominance(R, G, B) non-uniformity correction circuit(69, 70 or 9, 10) adapted to generate a correction signal for eliminating chrominance non-uniformity; a common voltage circuit(32 or 93, 96, 101) for a common voltage(see figures 3, 5, 6, 8; abstract; column 2; lines 32-45; column 5, lines 17-43; column 6, lines 15-68 and column 7, lines 1-47) and a display panel(59, 60, 61) for receiving the common voltage and a primary color video signal(R, G, B), a difference between the common voltage applied to a common electrode(43) and the primary color video signal applied to drain of a transistor(41) being applied to the display panel(liquid crystal cell 42)(see figures 3, 5, 6, 8; column 4, lines 57-68 and column 5, lines 1-16).

Muraji et al fail to disclose a common voltage adjustment circuit. Matsuo et al teach a common voltage adjustment circuit(35-38, 51-53) for adjusting a common voltage applied to a common electrode(8)(see figures 8, 12; column 5, lines 19-24; column 6, lines 15-66 and column 7, lines 3-25).

It would have been obvious to have modified Muraji et al with the teaching of Matsuo et al, so as to provide a picture with desired picture quality without any additional requirement for the video processing circuit(see column 6, lines 64-67)

As to **claim 13**, Muraji et al teach primary color video signal is one of a red

video signal, a green video signal, and a blue video signal(see figures 6, 8 and column 6, lines 15-21).

As to **claim 14**, Muraji et al teaches an LCD projector comprising a chrominance non-uniformity correction circuit(69) for superimposed correction signals to the primary color signal(R. G. B)(see figures 3, 8; column 5, lines 16-50 and column 7, lines 1-62).

As to **claims 12 and 15**, Muraji et al teach a brightness adjustment circuit(71,45) is adapted to adjust a brightness(the brightness of display signal is corresponding a voltage level or pulse width of a video signal) of the primary color video signal(R. G. B) in response to the chrominance non-uniformity correction signal(see figures 5, 6, 8; column 5, lines 9-13 and column 7, lines 28-51).

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muraji et al in view of and Matsuo et al and Song (5,831,709).

As to **claim 16**, Muraji et al fail to apply a correction voltage added to a common voltage.

Song teaches an LCD display for adding a correction voltage(a compensating voltage) to a common voltage(see figures 1 4a; column 1, lines 39-50 and column 5, lines 30-68 and column 6, lines 1-3).

It would have been obvious to have modified Muraji et al with the teaching of Song, since to compensate a common voltage is more simple than to compensate a video voltage.

(10) Response to Argument

Applicant argues Muraji fails to teach a difference between the specified voltage and a primary color video signal being applied to the common electrode 43 (of which is used in the rejection). Examiner respectfully disagrees. As claimed in claim 11 "a difference between said common voltage and said primary color video signal being applied to the display", the reference Muraji discloses several corrected video signals figures 7c-7e with a common electrode 43 shown in figure 5. As claimed, Muraji discloses a video signal to the display panel wherein that video signal is a difference between the video signal and the common electrode/voltage. Any voltage waveform can be seen as a difference between itself and the common electrode, ground for instance, wherein the difference would just be the voltage waveform itself.

Applicant further argues about a chrominance non-uniformity correction signal is superimposed onto said common voltage. This argument is moot since it was regarded as new matter and not added in an after final amendment.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

Conclusion

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

Art Unit: 2629

/ Christopher E. Leiby /

/Richard Hjerpe/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2629

Conferees:

/Bipin Shalwala/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2629

/Richard Hjerpe/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2629